"Rather than signaling the decline of the gendered organization, the equality with a vengeance era marks a shift in how gender is conceived and elaborated within the criminal justice system."

EMBODIED SURVEILLANCE AND THE GENDERING OF PUNISHMENT

JILL A. MCCORKEL
Northern Illinois University

JILL A. MCCORKEL is an assistant professor in the Sociology Department at Northern Illinois University. Her articles on drug policy, social control, and resistance in women's prisons have appeared in a number of journals, including Symbolic Interaction, Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, Drugs & Society, *and* Qualitative Sociology. *Her current research examines the conditions women face following their release from prison and documents their strategies for survival in the wake of changes in welfare policy and social service provision.*

Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, Vol. 32 No. 1, February 2003 41-76
DOI: 10.1177/0891241602238938
© 2003 Sage Publications

This ethnography explores the enactment of "get tough" politics in a state prison for women and considers whether the implementation of seemingly gender-neutral programs and policies implies that women's prisons are no longer operating as "gendered organizations." The author will demonstrate that even when women's prisons attempt to mimic the disciplinary policies associated with men's facilities, they modify disciplinary practices in response to perceived differences in offending between men and women. A crucial modification is the use of an "embodied surveillance" that sharply differs from Foucault's analysis of penal surveillance mechanisms. The article concludes with an analysis of how the practice of an embodied surveillance is embedded within a larger structure of gendered punishment.

Keywords: *prisons, gendered organizations, surveillance, drug treatment, Foucault*

Research on punishment and prison is dominated almost exclusively by explorations and accounts of men's institutions. Some of the earliest studies of women's prisons were comparative, examining sex role socialization and different styles of adaptation to prison life between men and women (Giallombardo 1966; Heffernan 1972). Later studies contrasted resources, deprivations, and programming in men's and women's prisons (Baskin et al. 1989; Ross and Fabiano 1986; Morash, Haarr, and Rucker 1994; Leonard 1983). This research was crucial because it challenged criminology's exclusive focus on male prisoners and problematized conditions in women's prisons. Furthermore, these studies of women's prisons raise important questions regarding how gender organizes the structure and practice of punishment.

This ethnography builds on earlier feminist scholarship by examining the prison as a "gendered organization" (Acker 1990). Acker's concept suggests that organizations are not gender neutral entities through which gendered bodies pass. Instead, she argued that organizational structure is fundamentally gendered. This concept has been elaborated in research studies of work organizations to demonstrate that gender-based wage differentials and the glass ceiling are not necessarily the by-

AUTHOR'S NOTE: An earlier version of this article was presented at the ninety-fifth annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, August 12-16, 2000, Washington, D.C. I am grateful to Jody Miller, Kristen Myers, Kirk Miller, and anonymous JCE *reviewers for their insightful comments.*

products of bad (male) managers encoding their sexism into decisions that otherwise violate the rationality of the organization (Cook and Waters 1998; England et al. 1994; Ridgeway 1997). Instead, these studies suggest that gender inequality is produced at the level of organizational structure—organizational conceptions of jobs, workers, and hierarchies are premised on a substructure of gender difference in which men's (hetero)sexuality, bodies, and relation to paid and unpaid labor serve as the ideal, a normative and material baseline for the universal worker. Acker (1992) contended that gender is "present in [the organization's] processes, practices, images, and ideologies, and distributions of power" (p. 567).

The implications of Acker's theory extend beyond studies of gender inequality in work organizations. Indeed, studies ranging from an examination of instrument selection in alternative rock bands (Clawson 1999) to an analysis of harassment in public places (Gardner 1995) suggest that Acker's theory of gendered organizations is a useful tool for grasping gender inequality in other forums. Britton (1999, 2000) has recently applied Acker's theory to prison organizations. Her research explores inmate supervision as a form of work and considers how the job of guarding female inmates became feminized over the course of the twentieth century. The present study builds on this literature but shifts from an examination of the gender politics of work in the paid labor market to the gender politics of punishment in the criminal justice system. Subsequently, my focus is on supervision and surveillance as aspects of punishment rather than as forms of work per se. As Foucault (1977) has demonstrated, the practice of punishment and surveillance is organized within a wider field of social relations. A number of prison scholars have used Foucault's history of the prison to consider the link between penal practices and the political economy. What is missing from this work is a consideration of women's prisons and the experiences of female inmates. Indeed, Foucault's work assumes that crucial concepts such as surveillance, discipline, and punishment are universal in their application. Recent feminist scholarship, however, would suggest that this may not be the case.

The present study analyzes qualitative data gathered during a four-year ethnographic investigation of a state prison for women. The intent of this research is to explore how gender is implicated in the mechanisms of surveillance and punishment and to examine why it figures so prominently in how punishment is conceived at the organizational

level. Building on the work of both Foucault and Acker, I will argue that punishment and surveillance are gendered concepts in the sense that they are enacted differently in men's and women's institutions and that differences in penal practice are legitimated within the prison organization by conceptualizing female inmates as both "gender deviants" and "deviant criminals."

FOUCAULT, PRISON, AND GENDER

The history of prison is almost exclusively the history of men's institutions. While Rafter (1995) and Freedman (1981) have made notable contributions through their analyses of the emergence of sex-segregated punishment and the birth of women's reformatories, discursive constructions of punishment, surveillance, resistance, and control within mainstream criminology remain premised on studies of men in male-dominated prisons, jails, and penitentiaries. The failure to include analyses of the practices, policies, and politics within women's prisons suggests that prominent theories and conceptualizations of punishment are partial, incomplete, and occlusive.

The omission of gender is particularly troubling in the case of Foucault, whose historical analyses of a variety of eighteenth-century disciplinary institutions have earned a prominent place in contemporary discussions of punishment and modern power. For Foucault (1977), the objective of modern disciplinary institutions and the surveillance mechanisms they employ is to produce "docile and useful bodies" (p. 138). Within the wider body of prison literature, the making of docile bodies is associated with the class politics of the paid labor market and men's access to factory work (for example, see Rusche and Kirchheimer 1939; Reiman 1998). Though Foucault's bodies masquerade as genderless in *Discipline and Punish*, the examples he used to elaborate his analysis suggest that these are in fact male bodies. Indeed, he explicitly used the example of soldiers' relations to their weapons and students' relations to their desks as indicative of the "body-object articulations" that form a "coercive link with the apparatus of production" (p. 153). As Bartky (1988) noted, "Foucault treats the body throughout as if it were one, as if the bodily experiences of men and women did not differ and as if men and women bore the same relationship to the characteristic institutions of modern life" (p. 63).

Bartky's (1988) criticism of Foucault centers on the observation that while men and women are herded through similar disciplinary institutions (e.g., public school), Foucault's analysis overlooks those disciplines that "produce a modality of embodiment that is explicitly feminine" (p. 64). Subsequently, Bartky called for an analysis of disciplinary practices and institutions such as the cosmetics and fashion industries whose explicit mission is to gender bodies. This is a valuable direction for future analyses to take, but it is possible to go another step forward. Bodies are not only gendered by specific practices and regimes intended to code them as masculine or feminine. Bodies are actively gendered within institutions whose stated mission is directed to other goals. For example, in Thorne's (1994) study of public elementary schools, she found that teachers and students have intricate mechanisms for gendering space and patterns of activity in the course of pursuing broader institutional goals such as discipline and literacy. In the act of organizing lines of students according to gender divisions (e.g., "girls in front, boys in back"), the school participates in the gendering of bodies. Thorne's observations are consistent with Acker's (1990) argument that precisely because organizations are not gender neutral, their policies and practices will both activate and sustain differentiation on the basis of gender. Subsequently, it is not necessarily the case that similar institutions will enact the same disciplinary practices for men and women. Given a gendered regime, we can expect that the nature and purpose of control and discipline will, in important instances, vary across gender.

Historical studies of women's reformatories make precisely this point. The purpose of disciplining the bodies of women in the reformatory system was not for work in the paid labor market but for reproductive labor in the domestic sphere (Rafter 1995; Freedman 1981; Feinman 1984). However, it was not only the case that institutions prepared men and women for different kinds of labor and, therefore, set them up to have different relations to the political economy. Studies of women's correctional facilities suggest the gendering of bodies also occurred through the act of discipline itself. In Rafter's (1995) work, it is clear that rape and sexual assault of women inmates by male guards serve as mechanisms for maintaining institutional order, as well as reinforcing men's dominance over women. In a study of intake procedures at the California Youth Authority during the 1960s, Rosenbaum and Chesney-Lind (1994) discovered that girls' case files routinely

included discussions of physical attractiveness as well as the results of gynecological determinations of virginity. The ability of female delinquents to successfully "do gender" was a crucial element in the logic and application of punishment and surveillance in this particular institution. Punishment, in other words, did not merely produce docile bodies. It produced docile girls.

Current research on women's prisons reveals two major sets of trends that distinguish contemporary facilities from their reformatory predecessors. First, criminal justice policies are increasingly punitive in nature. For example, Bloom, Chesney-Lind, and Owen (1994) reported that dramatic increases in the number of women incarcerated in California between 1982 and 1992 are not caused by a "worsening" of the types of crimes women commit; rather, the system has become more punitive toward women, particularly women convicted of drug-related offenses. Similar findings have been reported in Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New York, Connecticut, and Hawaii (for a review, see Chesney-Lind and Pollock 1995). Second, women's prisons have begun to resemble the architecture of men's. Facilities built in the 1980s and 1990s are no longer patterned after the cottage model with its manicured gardens and domestic amenities (Chesney-Lind and Pollock 1995; Owen 1998). Instead, institutions such as the Central California Women's Facility (CCWF) and Baylor Women's Correctional Institution in Delaware have razor wire, steel doors, security housing units (SHUs), and administrative segregation. In Illinois, even older institutions such as Dwight Women's Correctional Facility have transitioned former "dorms" into SHUs. Owen (1998) reported that in CCWF, the central concern among administrators is overcrowding, and they devote much of the facility's resources to security and population management. There is little emphasis on treatment and rehabilitation.

Notably, one characteristic of women's prisons that remains essentially unchanged is the limited availability of meaningful treatment, educational, and vocational programming. Vocational training continues to be mainly in feminized, low-wage occupations such as cosmetology, data entry, food services, and clerical work (Pollock 1990; Morash, Haarr, and Rucker 1994). Treatment, vocational, and educational programs have increased in number since the late 1980s following a series of successful 14th Amendment lawsuits challenging unequal treatment and denial of due process in women's facilities (Chesney-Lind and Pollock 1995; Pollock 1998). Unfortunately, many of the rehabilitative

programs mimic treatment modalities like boot camps and therapeutic communities (TCs) developed for and by men (see Lockwood, McCorkel, and Inciardi 1998; Pollock 1998). Such programs are often unable to deal with the complexity of women's criminality—particularly the ways in which offending is linked to women's experiences with physical and sexual victimization, poverty, and racism. So great is the mismatch between institutional programming and the needs of women prisoners that prominent criminologists such as Chesney-Lind and Pollock (1995) referred to this era in women's corrections as "equality with a vengeance."

The "equality" principle that characterizes this new era demands careful and thorough investigations into the structure and practice of social control in women's prisons. Historical studies suggest that discipline and control were organized according to highly gendered sets of expectations regarding the cult of "true" womanhood and women's place in society. Current research reveals a new twist in the gender politics animating women's prisons—women prisoners continue to suffer from unequal conditions, while, concomitantly, institutional policies and procedures appear to be gender neutral. This begs the question—has the salience of gender in women's prisons diminished over time? Feminist research on work organizations has documented how policies and procedures that masquerade as gender neutral actually serve to advantage men and disadvantage women while exacerbating conditions of gender inequality (see Acker 1990; Lorber 1994). Recent ethnographies such as Owen's (1998) suggest that gender has not disappeared from women's prisons; it has been reconstituted. Understanding the gender politics of the "equality with a vengeance" era requires detailed investigations into the practices, relationships, and policies within women's institutions. The present study contributes to this effort by examining the practices that constitute punishment and surveillance in a state prison for women. It is the goal of this analysis to delineate how and to what extent gender persists as a salient and urgent component of punishment.

RESEARCH SETTING AND METHOD

The present study is based on an ethnography conducted from 1994 through 1998 in East State, a medium-security state prison for women

located on the East Coast.[1] This was a particularly chaotic time in the prison's history. Unprecedented levels of overcrowding, spurred on in large part by the state's war on drugs, resulted in a series of inmate lawsuits that forced the state to build a new facility that would accommodate the steady tide of women sentenced to prison for drug offenses. The new prison was completed in 1992, and by the first half of 1993, the inmate population exceeded the new prison's rated capacity of two hundred. East State's administrators were in a bind. The construction of the new prison exacerbated budgetary dilemmas, and moreover, the department of corrections denied East State additional funds to expand the facility.[2] At the same time, projected increases in the inmate population over a five-year period meant that administrators could quickly find themselves facing another round of inmate-initiated lawsuits. In the midst of it all, state politicians continued to publicly express enthusiasm for the "get tough" platform and the war on drugs—characterized by massive arrests of low-level street dealers and lengthy, mandatory sentences. In short, administrators had no reason to believe that the overcrowding problem was going to disappear any time in the near future.

I arrived on the scene in the midst of the crisis. Desperate to find solutions to the overcrowding problem, officials at East State began a series of talks with researchers at the local university, social service providers, local judges, and private companies selling drug treatment services. For administrators at East State, the only apparent solution to the problem seemed to be a radical revisioning of their punishment regime. Recidivists constituted more than 40 percent of those sentenced to the institution, and the vast majority of recidivists (85 percent according to the warden) had persistent problems with illegal drugs (either as users, sellers, or both). After a series of conferences and some preliminary research on the extent to which drugs were implicated in the commission offenses of the inmate population, administrators concluded that the best strategy for dealing with the overcrowding problem was to host an experimental drug treatment program in the prison and to make conditions in the main facility more rigid or, in the words of the deputy warden, "more hard core."

The drug treatment program was a three-year demonstration project funded by a grant from a federal agency. At the conclusion of the three-year period, funding was to revert back to the state department of corrections pending the conclusions reached by an external evaluation

team and by administrators within the prison. I gained official access to the prison as a member of the evaluation team. In that role, I was provided with a high-level security clearance that allowed me to visit the institution at any time of day. For the most part, I was able to walk freely throughout the prison and talk to virtually anyone I came across. In addition, I was regularly invited to attend the warden's weekly conferences with top-level administrative staff, as well as classification meetings and various meetings with treatment providers. I was provided with copies of internal memos, prison newsletters, various sets of population statistics, and reports. When the evaluation was completed in 1997, I received permission from the warden and the director of the drug treatment program to remain in the prison and continue an independent ethnography that I had initiated in the summer of 1994. Throughout the four-year period, I conducted semistructured interviews with seventy-four inmates who, at one point during their time in East State, participated in the drug treatment program. In addition, I formally interviewed a total of thirteen administrators and influential decision makers within East State and the state department of corrections, ten correctional officers, and six counselors from the drug treatment program regarding their views on punishment, rehabilitation, and women offenders. This study is based on these interviews, as well as participant observation and thousands of informal conversations with inmates, former inmates, correctional officers, social workers, administrators, activists, family members, and counselors at East State.

In many ways, East State and the drug treatment program it hosted are particularly well suited for an analysis of how gender is implicated in the ideologies and mechanics of punishment. Overcrowding generated a legitimation crisis of sorts (see Habermas 1975). Administrators, correctional officers, and inmates began to question the politics, functions, and consequences of punishment as it was practiced in the institution. Central to this dialogue were assumptions about gender and questions about whether and to what extent women offenders were different from men and the implications of gender difference for social control in the institution. Subsequently, during this particular moment in the institution's history, gender was frequently in the foreground of discussions about punishment and was often a subject of considerable disagreement and debate. My participation in the setting offers a unique opportunity to glimpse how assumptions about gender are translated (and

contested) at the level of institutional control policies and interpersonal practices.

Furthermore, Project Rehabilitate Women (PRW), the drug treatment program that the institution agreed to play host to, represents the height of what Foucault (1977, 1980) defined as the nature of modern power. The structure of control in PRW and the program's philosophy of addiction are based on the TC model.[3] Practitioners believe that addiction is caused by a "disordered" or "diseased" personality that is attributable to a complex of biological, psychological, and social factors (Pan et al. 1993). The primary stated mission is to "habilitate" rather than "rehabilitate" inmates since the nature of their addictive disorders handicaps them in their ability to think, feel, and act in accordance with social norms (DeLeon 1997). Habilitation is accomplished, in part, by an emphasis on casual authority, visibility, surveillance, and public confrontation and humiliation.

PRW was among the first prison-based TCs for women in the country. Like other treatment modalities developed exclusively for men, PRW struggled with how much modification was necessary to accommodate the gender-specific needs of women inmates. It was the "sister" program to an in-prison TC for men that boasted better-than-average results with respect to recidivism, reoffending, and drug use. Prison Industries Inc. (PII), the company that had a contract with the state to develop and manage both TCs, did not want to tamper with success. In the end, very little modification was made to the structure of PRW, and the changes that were made could be considered little more than cosmetic. The program added a weekly session on parenting (e.g., how to discipline children, how to relieve stress, how to help with homework, etc.) but did not hold seminars or training sessions on other things that affected the women such as domestic violence, abuse, rape, loss of loved ones, racism, and poverty. Staff were never trained on "women's issues" (though this was initially promised by PII), nor were counselors hired who specialized in domestic violence and/or sexual abuse, despite the recommendations of evaluators. PRW staff and the management team of PII argued that addiction and abuse were separate and discrete issues. Their job was to treat addiction rather than abuse. Dr. Richardson, the vice president in charge of treatment services, explained in an interview that modifications to the structure and content of the TC were unnecessary because victimization was not just a "women's issue":

> The men in [prison TC] have been victimized too but they don't focus on it. Women in [PRW] are really weak in this regard. They won't focus on what they need to be focusing on [addiction]. Instead, they wallow in victimization.

Subsequently, there is little that distinguishes PRW's structure from that of the men's program. It houses a total of forty-six inmates for the six- to eighteen-month period prior to their release and is organized according to a rational authority model in which staff serve as a fixed set of leaders in the community. Beneath them, authority positions are graded with residents occupying positions of power according to their seniority and their ability to follow a strict set of rules. Staff are rarely visible as leaders—it is the residents who are responsible for organizing the day-to-day affairs of life in the community. Residents are expected to police themselves and one another. The failure to do so often results in punishments more severe than those received by the actual offender(s).

It is important to note that many of the characteristics of control in the program mirror those of the disciplinary institutions Foucault studied. For example, power is capillary, in that it is everywhere and not located merely with a particular individual or vested position. Furthermore, since the aim of control is "habilitation" rather than repression per se, the nature of power in the program becomes self-amplifying. For Foucault (1977), self-amplification refers to the fact that modern power does not simply act as a counterweight to an oppositional force; rather, modern power is enhanced through the course of its own exercise. In the case of PRW, discipline is accomplished through public rituals in which offenders are confronted by staff and residents regarding their misdeeds and are then subject to lengthy and often painful analyses regarding the nature of their "real" selves (see McCorkel 1998). The confrontations reinforce the program's philosophy (deviant behavior reflects the state of the diseased self) and the vulnerability of all residents to the iron grip of the collective gaze. A third parallel between PRW and Foucault's penitentiary is that the visibility afforded by both the architecture of the program unit and the pervasiveness of surveillance mechanisms[4] contributes to the production of "cases" in which control over the subject is linked to intimate knowledge of her habits, desires, history, perversities, and fears.

PRW exerted considerable influence over the wider dynamic of punishment and control in East State. The differences between the prison and PRW were a matter of degree. By the end of the 1990s, the paternalism that had previously characterized the institution's approach to inmates had given way to the "hard core" disciplinary practices of PRW. The prison even underwent a series of cosmetic changes (from the blacking out of windows in the central control room to the installation of metal detectors in the front lobby) to symbolize the administration's commitment to surveillance and security. Though the relationship between PRW and the prison was often rocky, they shared a common problem (overcrowding), promoted a common solution (drug treatment), and held similar beliefs regarding gender and punishment. For these reasons, a sizable portion of the analysis that follows is devoted to an examination of practices and interactions occurring within PRW.

Furthermore, the analysis itself is organized around the detailed examination of a single event—a therapy session known as the encounter group (EG)—and the incident that precipitated it. Although the analysis is supplemented with interview and participant observation data gathered over the course of the four-year period, I made the decision to focus on this event rather than countless others for three reasons. First, the interactions and control strategies that ensue in the course of the EG are representative of the internal dynamics within the facility. The EG is what distinguishes the TC from other treatment modalities, and "pinball" (a version of the EG used in PRW) is what distinguishes PRW's tactics as hard core. Second, pinball and EG sessions are central to mythology and ritual within East State prison. Both staff and inmates reconstruct, re-create, and reinterpret the interactions that unfold during the sessions. Often, dramatic retellings of a single episode pass throughout the prison for weeks. Third, the decision to develop the analysis across thick description rather than bundling it in neat typologies is based on the subject matter itself. Prison is not a familiar place for most readers. Moreover, the internal dynamics of prison programs have long been referred to as a "black box" given the paucity of data that exists regarding the actual practices and interactions that occur therein (see Pan et al. 1993; Pollock 1998). Since this is a study of how discipline and surveillance can be understood as gendered concepts, it is necessary to spend some time scrutinizing how they were enacted. Subsequently, to cast some light on a black box, I have chosen to

provide an in-depth account of the type of confrontation that characterizes the hard core approach to disciplining women inmates.

DISCIPLINE THROUGH CONFRONTATION

EGs were popular among both residents and staff of the PRW program. Indeed, clinicians from PII and counselors in the program regarded these groups as the quintessential characteristic that distinguished the TC from other forms of therapy. The appeal for residents was that the group provided them with a forum for expressing their anger, outrage, and pain in response to the words or misdeeds of other residents in the program. As one resident put it, "EG lets us blow off steam and get everything out in the open." In most cases, the appeal of "blowing off steam" outweighed residents' fears that they would be among those who were selected for confrontation and, when they were, the humiliation associated with being the target of such a confrontation.[5] According to the program director, the therapeutic purpose of EGs was twofold. First, by mobilizing peer pressure against the target, the groups were intended to challenge the way the target conceptualized her "real" self and to make her aware of how her actions affected others around her. Second, EGs were intended to teach women how to control their emotions, something PRW staff did not believe their clients were particularly well equipped to do. Indeed, by preventing targets from responding to the accusations leveled against them, PRW staff believed that the groups forced residents to come to grips with the powerful emotions that arose during the sessions. Beyond therapeutic goals, however, EGs were popular with counselors because they provided a wealth of information about residents (e.g., how often rules are violated, the substance of rule violations, relations among residents in the program, etc.).

EGs groups took a variety of forms, depending on the number of residents available for the session, the substance and frequency of rule infractions, and the intensity of the tensions running between and among residents and staff. When tensions were high, residents were considerably more likely to disobey program rules and challenge the authority of staff. To regain control, staff and high-ranking residents modified the traditional EG into a game referred to as pinball. In a

pinball session, the target sits alone in the middle of a circle of residents and is confronted in rapid-fire style by staff, as well as by other residents whom the staff hand selects to participate in the confrontation.[6] Pinball differs from the traditional EG mainly in terms of how much pressure is brought to bear on the target. In the traditional group, the target is not physically singled out and placed in the center of the group but instead remains seated among her peers. Also, only residents who actually reported the target to the staff for engaging in a rule violation were allowed to participate in the confrontation, and the confrontations themselves were limited to a total of five minutes. In pinball, staff could designate anyone to participate in the confrontation, and there was no limit on the duration of the session. Furthermore, pinball sessions did not function as a forum for residents to critique one another but for the staff and supervisory residents to strongly condemn the behaviors and attitudes of residents deemed "troublemakers." Residents who were selected by the staff to participate in the confrontation generally echoed the sentiments of the staff members rather than expressing their own feelings about the target's actions. In all, this type of game allowed staff to bring considerable social pressure to bear on selected targets.

EGs were scheduled to be held twice a week, but over the course of my participation in the program, they only occurred once a week or once every other week. Although the groups themselves were considered the cornerstone of therapy in the TC modality, paperwork demands and staffing problems frequently prevented the counselors from holding the groups on a biweekly basis. The failure to hold groups, particularly groups that served as an outlet for relieving the frustrations residents experienced toward one another and the program, caused considerable control problems for the staff. For example, during one such period after the group had not been held for two weeks, Sarah walked off the floor and into her room while one of the counselors was admonishing her for passing a note to another woman in the program. Such blatant disrespect for the authority of a counselor was infrequent and signaled, according to staff, the potential for widespread disruption. Counselor Tynice explained,

> You can't let them be up in your face because they'll keep pushing it and pushing it until they've got control. That's how they do it on the street and with their families. They take and they push, till they get what they want—drugs, money, whatever. You let one of them do it without answering back and you've put whatever you've accomplished with the

> rest of them in jeopardy. Deep inside they're still addicts, no matter what they look like on the surface, and they'll take advantage if they can. Part of our job is knowing when it's [rule violations] going on and putting a stop to it.

At exactly ten o'clock in the morning after Sarah's act of insubordination, Counselor Tynice convened the residents in the center of the unit and instructed them to set up the chairs in a circle for a game of pinball. Several women broke into a trot toward the storage area and emerged with dozens of plastic chairs, murmuring to each other all the while. Newer residents asked the more experienced what pinball was, since many had never seen or heard of this particular version of the EG, while other residents speculated about who among them was "gonna get it" from the counselors. In minutes, all of the women in the program were seated and comported in the "ready for treatment" posture (feet on the floor, backs straight, chins set and lifted, faces expressionless, and hands placed palms down on the knees). Standing in the doorway to the staff office with two other counselors, Counselor Tynice looked sternly around the room, taking a moment to look directly into the eyes of the women who faced her. After whispering for a moment or two with the other staff members, Tynice strode into the center of the circle wheeling behind her an office desk chair. Before taking a seat beside one of the residents in the circle, she took great care to place the desk chair in the precise center of the circle, aligned almost directly underneath a glass skylight in the unit's ceiling.

As she moved to take her seat, Tynice called, "Sarah, you can take the seat in the middle. Put your hands on your knees and spin toward me." Sarah did as she was told, though breaking with program etiquette by glancing at two other residents in the circle and rolling her eyes. She swiveled the office chair so that she was facing Counselor Tynice and, with chin held high, stared directly at the counselor.

> Family,[7] I put you in this circle today to give you some information which you so desperately need about yourself and your emotions. You see, you're not in control like you think you are. You ain't got no control at all. Know how I know that?

At the beginning of the confrontation, Counselor Tynice's voice was low, barely audible. By the time she spoke of Sarah's lack of control, however, her voice was booming so that the question came out as a

controlled scream. The other residents, who were leaning forward in their chairs to hear her, jumped back almost in tandem as she began yelling.

"Sarah, I asked you a question. Do you know how I know that you're not in control? Dialogue."[8] Sarah, her faced flushed, shook her head negatively.

> Sarah, I instructed you to dialogue, not gesture. I'm going to ask again and this time I want an answer. You're not going to control me or this session. You can't, you don't have the control you think you do. Now, I asked you twice, and I'm asking you again, and unless you're truly so dumb or so confused as to not know the answer, I want to know why I know, but you don't seem to, that you're not in control.

With her jaw set firmly Sarah responded, "I control what I think and how I behave, not you. Isn't that what this program is telling us? That we're responsible for our behaviors. . . ."

> *Counselor Tynice:* Family, that's enough. That's it, I've had it with your attitude. If you were truly in control, if you had all this power, would you be in here? What kind of woman, what kind of mother, would choose—if she had control—would choose to be in prison? Come on, family, you're talking shit now and we all know it. Responsibility and control are two different matters. I know you don't got no learning disabilities or other serious mental impairments, so you better believe that you're responsible for what you do. I'm holding you responsible right now for your negative behavior the other day.

The onlookers remained riveted on Sarah throughout Counselor Tynice's discussion. A bead of sweat slid down Sarah's forehead.

> *Sarah:* You're saying that I don't have any control, and you're asking me how you know that? Well, I guess you know that 'cause you got all them bitches in here monitoring everyone's behavior all the time, and we can't make a move without one of them ass kissers all up in your office saying, "Oh, Sarah did this and that to this one and said these nontherapeutical things and all that." I guess you know about me 'cause you is watching me and you think you know me.

As Sarah spoke, she glared at one of the women in the room whose assigned job as "expediter" required that she "act as the eyes and ears of

the community." In terms of the program's social hierarchy, the expediter was responsible for ensuring that residents reported one another for rule violations and forwarding these reports directly to staff members.

> *Counselor Tynice:* Sarah, I know you're not in control of yourself because I understand the disease of addiction. I know what an addict looks like, feels like, thinks like. I can read the signs, and sister, they're written all over you. Does this sound like you? You can't deal with your emotions and you try to control them by taking your drugs. What was yours? Oh yeah, you was a whore for your crack, I remember. And when you whored around with all those men, you was manipulating all right. But not just them, no, no. You were repressing those emotions, but as you did you let crack rule you. You let those men rule you; you manipulated yourself. A whore is helpless, and that is you.

As Counselor Tynice spoke, Sarah's shoulders rolled in toward her chest and she began to cry. Her eyes were cast downward, and she appeared to be gazing at the leg of Tynice's chair. Around the room, other residents fidgeted in their seats, some looked at Counselor Tynice, and others looked blankly at one another. No one, with the exception of Counselor Tynice and the two counselors who stood in the corner of the facility, looked at Sarah. The scene was strangely ethereal as a ray of sun streaming into the room from the skylight above cast itself directly onto Sarah, who sat slumped on the office chair. Indeed, the setting, the participants, and the image of a lone figure humbled before the sun's rays were eerily reminiscent of Eastern State Penitentiary, the American archetype of Jeremy Bentham's *Panopticon*, an eighteenth-century blueprint for the optimization of social control in total institutions.

Like Jeremy Bentham's design of the Panopticon and early American penitentiaries such as Philadelphia's Eastern State, PRW sought to maximize control of inmate behavior through an architecture that allowed for continuous surveillance (Foucault 1977; Beaumont and de Tocqueville [1833] 1964). In PRW, this was realized by the arrangement of inmate cells in a two-tiered semicircle along the outside wall of the unit. All of the rooms faced the guard station and staff offices, and each had a window that was eight inches wide and ran the length of the door, allowing anyone within a few feet of the cell to see the activities taking place inside. Supervision was further enhanced by the requirement that residents oversee one another and report rule violations,

which created a system of interpersonal surveillance networks. The surveillance networks contributed to the arrangement of an interaction order in which any and all thoughts, feelings, or behaviors were potentially knowable to everyone within the community.

The program's fixation with control through surveillance is rooted in its quest to reform the "flawed" characters of the women. Eighteenth- and nineteenth-century penal reformers did so by designing the "separate system" that sought to ritualistically purify the prison environment by housing inmates in individual, separate cells (thereby eliminating the possibilities for moral contagion that were theorized to arise when prisoners interacted with one another) (Rothman 1971; Beaumont and de Tocqueville [1833] 1964). Purity was also sought through promoting the prisoners' spiritual connectedness with god, and to that end, the ceiling of each cell housed a small window that allowed a single shaft of light to penetrate the room. Inmates were told that the ray of light was the "hand of god" and that during those hours in which the sun shone in their cells, they were to kneel before the light and engage in intense and solemn deliberations about their character and the possibilities of reform while in the "spiritual presence of the Maker" (Barnes 1926, 162).

It is doubtful, of course, that Counselor Tynice's effort to place the pinball chair in the direct path of the sunlight was a deliberate reference to eighteenth-century penology. Nor was it intended to symbolize an omniscient god.[9] On the other hand, the act of placing the intended receiver of one of these confrontations in the direct path of the sun was not unintentional. The counselors did so with too great a frequency and too deliberate a method for it to be merely coincidence. Indeed, the term *hot seat* as a moniker for the center chair was coined by residents to dually refer to the emotional discomfort associated with being the target of a confrontation as well as the physical discomfort of being forced to sit directly in the sun throughout the duration of the confrontational episode.

In PRW, the emphasis on purity and the ritualistic cleansing of moral contamination from the residents is just as intense as it was for the early penal reformers; however, it is not the eyes of god that symbolize the totality of institutional control, nor is it the souls of inmates that mark the target of social control efforts. In fact, it is the self, rather than the soul, that is regarded as befouled, and it is the diagnostic powers of the professional therapist that are celebrated as the higher power from

which moral salvation is to be achieved. But at the heart of diagnostic power is premised an overwhelming concern for, and reliance on, surveillance. This, then, is what is represented with the placing of the desk chair in the sun—the awesome heat and intense brightness of the sun's rays as they shine through the single skylight in the unit's ceiling are at once symbolic of the counselors' omniscience and the denudation of the residents' selves.

THERAPY AND SURVEILLANCE

The importance of Bentham's *Panopticon* and the early penitentiary system for the present study is that this period in history represents not only the birth of the modern prison but the emergence of a system of social control premised on surveillance. In Foucault's (1977) analysis of the eighteenth-century penitentiary system, he argued that through incarceration and surveillance, the institution of the prison is quite literally inserted into the mind of the prisoner. Consider the architectural design of early American penitentiaries modeled after the Panopticon. Several tiers of cells were arranged in a circular pattern, all of which surrounded a central guard tower. The activities occurring at any moment, in any corner of each of the cells, were entirely visible to guards stationed in the tower. The activities of guards within the central tower, however, were invisible and unknown to the prisoners watching from their cells. The Panopticon represented a style of surveillance that was continuous, visible, and yet unverifiable (p. 201). The surveillance was visible and continuous because the inmates were aware of the omnipresence of the guard tower and knew that during any given moment, they were being watched from the tower. The act of observation was itself unverifiable because, ultimately, the inmates never knew exactly when the guards were watching them. With a system of visible, continuous, and yet unverifiable surveillance, the act of social control becomes one of self-control. Inmates organize their behaviors on the assumption that they are being observed and not only conform with institutional rules but internalize them as well. And while the institution continues to control bodies in the sense that they regulate movement to and from the cells, the body is no longer the target of institutional control as it is in the case of corporal punishment. The target is the mind, as the pervasiveness of surveillance forces the prisoner to adopt the role of

the other (in this case the prison) and view himself or herself from the perspective of the institution. It is a system of social control that influences not simply the behavior but the perception of inmates.

Therapy, itself a system of social control, also endeavors to alter perception (Horwitz 1984; Szasz 1963). In particular, the work of therapy involves challenging the client's perceptions about the self by providing him or her with a reinterpretation of the behavior, attitudes, feelings, and events occurring throughout his or her life course (Bloor, McKeganey, and Fonkert 1988; Hardesty 1986). Sociological analyses of therapy have often focused on the extent to which therapists actively construct an alternate reality about the lives and selves of their patients, particularly women, but such analyses have downplayed the importance of surveillance (see Russell 1995; Gill and Maynard 1995; Warren 1991; Bloor, McKeganey, and Fonkert 1988; Goffman 1961).

The connection between therapy and surveillance is not a new one. The early penal reformers, interested in rehabilitation rather than vengeful punishment, regarded penitentiaries as a therapeutic rather than a punitive environment (Hirsch 1992). What qualified the penitentiary as a rehabilitative institution was the requirement that inmates develop a spiritual connectedness with god and, more important, that totalizing surveillance (embodied by the symbolic eye of god and the literal eyes of guards) produced total conformity. Penal reformers of the day argued that inmates, in fear of being labeled deviants, would align their behavior with institutional and social conventions since they knew that doing otherwise would undoubtedly be discovered by either their god or their keepers. As Foucault (1980) noted of penal reformers, "They thought people would become virtuous by the simple fact of being observed" (p. 161).[10]

A similar assumption undergirds the structure of punishment within East State. I have indicated how architecture and the formal structuring of relationships among residents combine to produce a surveillance mechanism that is virtually impenetrable. But surveillance is not only embedded in the structure of the program, it is celebrated in the program's culture. For example, throughout the unit there are handmade posters designed by residents and commissioned by the staff that are composed in the center by a large, blue eye. Beneath the eye are the words (sometimes stenciled, sometimes handwritten), "EVERYWHERE YOU GO, EVERYTHING YOU DO, KNOW THAT SOMEONE IS WATCHING YOU." More recently, the phrase

was modified to read, "EVERYWHERE YOU GO, EVERYTHING YOU DO, THE EYES ARE ALWAYS WATCHING YOU." There are also signs rewarding residents whose surveillance performance is deemed to be excellent by the staff. These posters depict the same blue eye with the words "MOST AWARE" written underneath it. Each week, a new name is Velcroed to the bottom of the poster, and a "MOST AWARE" sticker is placed on the door of the week's most celebrated resident. All of these signs appear almost everywhere in the facility, on resident doors, inside resident cells, and on the front and back walls of the large group room. The only place where the signs do not appear is within the environs of staff offices.

The signs first began to appear around the unit during the program's tenth month of operation. The program's first months in the prison were difficult ones. Counselors had a hard time recruiting inmates into the program and were barely able to fill half of the forty-six program beds. Furthermore, the rate at which residents prematurely left the program ranged from 65 percent to 80 percent during that period. The program was under considerable pressure from the prison administration, the state government, and grant administrators to fill the beds. They made arrangements with drug court judges to sentence women directly into the program and stipulated that dropouts would receive lengthier prison terms. In addition, instead of using the knowledge of program residents to improve recruitment and retention efforts by asking for their suggestions, the program opted to crack down on "immature" behavior in the unit (which consisted of smuggling forbidden candy into the unit, hair styling, and writing love letters) by placing more stringent demands on behavior, limiting various privileges, and increasing the amount of surveillance directed at residents' behavior. Counselors instructed residents to make the signs to remind themselves that they were always being watched.[11] During a meeting with evaluators, PRW's director explained that the crackdown was necessary because the women lacked "structure" in their lives. Rules and guidelines for even the most minute behaviors (e.g., when, where, and how to brush one's teeth and proper cleaning procedure and storage space for the brush) were necessary, she explained, because the women were poorly socialized. Indeed, one of her most frequently repeated statements to public officials, evaluators, prison administrators, and other program outsiders was that PRW "has to do habilitation with these women before we ever even think about *RE-habilitation*!" (emphasis hers).

Regardless of the reasons behind the increase in surveillance and program rules, the shift was felt by the residents. Latasha, a resident who had been in the program from its inception, experienced the evolution firsthand:

> In the beginning there was a lot of confusion and not much control, er, control in terms of them [staff] just watching and waiting for us to do somethin' bad, you know? But I didn't mind it in the beginning; it wasn't bad like it sounds. I mean the confusion, that wasn't so bad 'cause it was like we was *all* trying to set up this therapeutical community. Like we all had a part in it. Now, they's just telling us we're sick and we need some structure. Well, yeah, you know, I'm in here to get some help for my sickness, but I didn't think help would be no prison. Yeah, that's it! They watch us more than the COs [correctional officers] did in general pop. And all that watching, it gets to you. . . . It's not like you're necessarily doing something bad; it's just you don't want everything about yourself to be known by everyone. You want to keep some stuff private, even if it ain't stuff that's embarrassing and believe me they know all about the embarrassing stuff [laughs and discusses how staff and residents discussed her bout with diarrhea for several moments at a house meeting]. . . . You want to keep stuff private because it's private. It's that part of you that is yours, that you know.

A fundamental part of punishment within PRW and the prison more generally is behavioral control, and most frequently this control is achieved through complete surveillance. Like the eighteenth-century reformers, counselors believed that the awareness of a pervasive system of surveillance would inhibit residents from engaging in deviant acts. In response to a question about why residents were given very little privacy in the program, Counselor Elizabeth answered,

> Well, they're addicts. What do you expect? The problem with addicts is if you give them enough rope, they'll hang themselves. It's in their nature. The thing about addiction is that it's a disease of the whole person—that means what they do in every part of their life. I don't care if it's pissing. You let them piss alone and they'll find a way to fuck everything up. That's who they are. It's the nature of the beast.

In this sense, the rhetoric of program staff is quite similar to that of the early penal reformers—constant vigilance is required to prevent deviant persons from engaging in deviant behavior. And while the

continuity and visibility of surveillance are not embodied in the form of a guard tower erected in the center of the unit, they are symbolized by the images of eyes that are hung throughout the unit and ritualized in confrontation ceremonies where behaviors thought to be hidden from scrutiny are made the subject of public discussion.

Such was the case during the initial confrontation between Counselor Tynice and Sarah that had later given rise to the pinball session. Sarah had written two letters to Joyce indicating that she was having romantic feelings toward her. The counselors officially learned of the letters when Joyce, after receiving the second letter, reported it to the expediter who, in turn, told the staff.[12] After reading the letters and passing them to other staff members, Counselor Tynice waited only a few minutes to call all the residents into the center of the unit. "Family, one of you—maybe more—sure has been up to some sneaky things. Some things you thought maybe you could hide; maybe you thought that something taking place behind closed doors was a secret. FAMILY," and at this point Tynice was yelling, "DO WE HAVE SECRETS IN THIS HOUSE?" The residents collectively shook their heads in the negative, and some murmured "no."

"Sarah, get up to the center of the floor." Sarah looked at Counselor Tynice and pointed to herself while mouthing the word, "Me?" When Tynice nodded, Sarah rose from where she was sitting and walked to the center of the room. A resident who had never been in any kind of significant trouble before, Sarah seemed shocked as did several members of the audience.

"What have you been up to behind our backs, Sarah? What secrets have you been keeping?" Tynice looked disgusted. At first Sarah denied keeping any secrets, but after being questioned several more times by Tynice, she divulged that she had smuggled a candy bar into the unit that she had shared with two other residents in the program.

"Well, you're right about that, but it ain't no candy bar that I'm concerned with right now. It's that other sweet tooth you got is what I'm concerned with." Tynice waved the letters in the air. "Do you know what these are, Sarah?" Sarah shook her head negatively. "These are letters from you to another woman." Sarah stared stonily at Tynice, but her shaking hands belied her surprise.

"These are letters from you to another woman in here, indicating your romantic interest in this woman." Tynice read from part of the letter and asked, "Did you write these letters, Sarah?"

"No, no," Sarah managed to stammer. Tynice called Joyce to stand beside Sarah on the floor and asked, "Joyce, did you receive these letters?" Sarah glanced at Joyce just long enough to see Joyce nod. Tynice repeated the question, "Sarah, did you write these letters?"

"No, I didn't. I ain't no lesbian; everyone in here knows that." Tynice looked at Joyce and asked, "Who gave you these letters?"

"Sarah did, ma'am." Joyce's head was lowered. Several of the women in the audience gasped.

Sarah: That's a lie; I'm not homosexual and I didn't write no romantic letters to another woman—

Counselor Tynice: Come on, Sarah. You know we were gonna find out sooner or later. I got Joyce saying you did it, and not only that, but several people in this house including your roommate remember seeing you write notes during your free time, and I got a person that says she saw you pass the note to Joyce.

Sarah glared at Joyce who was still standing beside her. "What does that sign behind you say, Sarah?" Sarah turned to look at one of the posters of the blue eye. She mumbled, "Everywhere you go, everything you do, someone is always watching you."

"We're watching you, Sarah. Got it? Now admit this so we can move on and those things the addict keeps hidden can come out into the light." Sarah shook her head at Tynice and ran off the floor into her cell, slamming the door on the way in.

EMBODIED SURVEILLANCE

Confrontation ceremonies such as the one recounted above remind residents of both the continuity of surveillance (that it is ever present) and the intrusiveness of surveillance (that it has access to behavior that is put on for public display as well as private thoughts and feelings). But the ceremonies do something more. They emphasize to residents that this is an embodied surveillance, wherein the observer and the observed are known to one another. It is, in fact, a verifiable form of surveillance, although verification may occur after the fact. This is a significant difference from the disembodied method of observation that Foucault (1977, 1980) discussed in his analysis of the penitentiary. Unable to discern whether or by whom they were being watched, inmates in the

Panopticon were arguably prevented from even the thought of revolt. As Foucault (1977) explained,

> He is the object of information, never a subject in communication. . . . And this invisibility is a guarantee of social order. [Among convicts] there is no danger or a plot, an attempt at collective escape . . . that this architectural apparatus should be a machine for creating and sustaining a power relation independent of the person who exercises it; in short, that the inmates should be caught up in a power situation of which they are themselves the bearers. (pp. 200-201)

In PRW, there was no effort to hide the identities of witnesses from those who stood accused of wrongdoing or an attempt to render surveillance as anything less than a universal responsibility demanded of every resident in the program. For Foucault, the ability of the observed to identify their observers creates the potential for disruptions in the social order and thereby threatens to erode the institution's control over inmate behavior. To be sure, verifiability creates problems of order in PRW, but it does so in a way that solidifies the power of the counseling staff over their charges. The situation between Sarah and Joyce is an important one in this regard. Staff sought to prevent residents from becoming friends with one another (one of the most frequent phrases uttered by staff members to residents was, "There are no friends in treatment") because they regarded the friendship dyad as having the potential to usurp therapeutic control. Close relations with peers (be they romantically motivated or otherwise) jeopardize surveillance since friends will be less likely to report one another for subversive thoughts and behaviors. To prevent the formation of friendships and other types of intimate relations, staff went to great lengths to force friends to confront one another for misdeeds. This appeared to be largely successful as the majority of residents reported that they "trusted no one" in the program. With such confrontations, disruptions in order occurred, but order was only destabilized at the bottom, not the top. In the case of Sarah and Joyce in the weeks following the confrontation, Sarah stopped talking to Joyce altogether and took an active role in trying to get her in trouble with staff. Indeed, the challenge Sarah's defiance posed for the authority of the counseling staff was not only neutralized but was used to reify surveillance and increase the legitimacy of the staff's diagnostic abilities.

In fact, surveillance need not be anonymous as it was in men's penitentiaries because surveillance is intimately related to the process of diagnosis, rather than existing simply to prevent the occurrence of behaviors that deviate from institutional guidelines. Indeed, an embodied surveillance where the observer and the observed are known to one another was preferred in this setting because it lent greater validity to the therapeutic diagnosis. This was the case in the scenario depicted at the beginning of the analysis section. Sarah, initially confident enough in her own knowledge of self to act defiantly in front of Counselor Tynice (first by terminating a confrontation and later by challenging Counselor Tynice's assessment of her as "not in control"), suffered a virtual mental and physical collapse toward the conclusion of the pinball confrontation. Sarah's final statement while still on the hot seat in the center of the group indicates a newfound insecurity with respect to her ability to understand herself and her relations with others:

> What you said hurts, it does. . . . But it's true. It's all true. I did those things; I am those things. I guess I just needed someone else to see it—what I couldn't see myself, about myself. The control is something I want, that I wanted, which I thought I could get at . . . could achieve it [begins to cry]. Today, now, feeling helpless, I know that you've helped me to get in touch with my real feelings. I am helpless against this disease [addiction].

In sum, the purpose of surveillance for punishment in PRW and East State more generally is threefold. First, as was the case in the early penitentiaries, surveillance is a repressive device in that it is used as a mechanism of control designed to prevent the occurrence of rule-breaking behavior. Given the severity of the penalties associated with violating program rules, staff believed residents were unlikely to engage in rule-breaking behavior if they knew they were being watched. Counselors justified repressive measures by referencing the "manipulative" and "criminogenic" selves of addicts. Staff's claims about the self were alluded to earlier in the quotation from Counselor Elizabeth regarding the necessity of eliminating zones of privacy to prevent "poorly socialized" women from "fucking everything up." It is not possible within the perimeters of this particular article to examine the organizational construction of residents' identities in great detail, but it is important to emphasize here that beliefs about the women's lack of "socialization"

and "structure" were the primary discursive mechanism used to justify the program's extensive use of repression and surveillance.

The second characteristic of surveillance is that it is productive. By this I mean to suggest that surveillance yields information about the women that is central to the interpretive process and thus the diagnostics of therapy. The discussion of Sarah's rule breaking illustrates this point well. Counselor Tynice interpreted available information about Sarah (e.g., the romantic content of a note, claims to heterosexuality, and walking off the floor in the middle of a confrontation) as intentional defiance of the program norms and diagnosed her as being "out of control." Furthermore, information that is garnered through confrontation operates to further enhance control structures as aggrieved residents like Sarah vow to report others who engage in rule violations. Diagnosis and discipline are ultimately extensions of the surveillance mechanism.

Third, the embodied nature of the surveillance mechanism functions to legitimate therapeutic diagnoses. Again, using Sarah as an example, the veracity of Counselor Tynice's claim was established not through reference to her own professional competence (e.g., I've been a drug and alcohol counselor for ten years) but through the observations of Sarah's behavior by Tynice and the others. It did not occur to Sarah to contest the observation, only the initial claim that she was out of control.

THE GENDERING OF PUNISHMENT

It is clear that surveillance operates differently in PRW and East State than it does in men's institutions. The reason that it does is because surveillance in women's prisons is intimately related to the process of diagnosis, rather than simply existing to prevent the occurrence of behaviors that threaten institutional security, however broadly conceived. Emphasis within men's institutions across the state was on repression, deprivation, and warehousing—a trend that was replicated in men's prisons across the country throughout the 1980s and 1990s (Irwin and Austin 1997). Ironically, PRW's "brother" program was marginalized within the men's prison. Despite the success of outcome data and the increasing proportion of drug offenders among the inmate population, prison administrators were unwilling and uninterested in

working with the TC either to increase its size or to expand outreach services to inmates in the general population.[13]

The women's facility was also influenced by "get tough" politics, though not in quite the same way. The popularity of the get tough philosophy was evident in the early meetings administrators held with criminal justice professionals regarding the overcrowding problem. Administrators theorized if they were not so "soft," women would "think twice" before committing another crime upon their release. PRW's appeal (beyond the fact that it was a federally funded program for the first three years of operation) was that it offered, in the words of the warden, "a more rigorous form of therapy." PRW was considered "hard core." Nonetheless, the reason that PRW survived and prospered within the institution had as much to do with its appearance as a get tough program that emphasized personal responsibility for one's crimes as it did with the fact that PRW promised to habilitate the diseased selves of women drug offenders.

This begs the question—why are therapy and diagnosis so tightly bound up with punishment in East State? The answer can be found in the contradictory ways administrators, counselors, and prison staff conceptualize criminality in general and women's criminality in particular. The get tough philosophy is premised, in part, on the belief that the criminal's actions are based on rational, self-interested calculations. Masculinity is implicit in this construction of the criminal—the "typical" criminal is a masculine subject. Criminals are motivated by power and economics; they are dissuaded by harsh penalties and the likelihood of capture. East State's transition to hard core punishment was legitimated by referring to this popular discursive construction of the criminal. Administrators did not attribute the upward surge in the prison population to the increased surveillance and mandatory sentencing policies of the drug war; rather, they saw increases as an outcome of the decisions and actions of individual offenders.

At the same time, constructions of the "typical" criminal competed with what prison staff understood as the "reality" of women's crime. In interviews, staff and administrators would frequently contrast the economic aspect of men's crimes with the baseness and "sickness" of women's. During an interview, the warden explained,

> Yeah, poverty plays a role. You don't see a lot of college students or rich divorcees in here. At the same time, there is something else going on.

> Poor men stick somebody up or sell drugs. To me, as strange as this may sound coming from a warden, that is understandable. I can see how you would make that choice. Women degrade themselves. Selling themselves, you should hear some of the stuff they do. There is no sense of self-respect, of dignity. . . . There is something wrong on the inside that makes an individual take up those kind of behaviors and choices.

Women are considered "deviant criminals" in the sense that their choice of crimes is seemingly inexplicable. Their crimes are not seen as rational responses to structural conditions in the way that men's crimes are. Ironically, the fact that women do participate in crime categories such as robbery and drug sales is overshadowed by their participation in certain types of crime, particularly drug use and prostitution, which is considered evidence of women's deviance as offenders.

Administrators, staff, and decision makers use psychological rather than structural explanations to account for women's criminality and justify this by reporting, in great detail, inmates' departures from appropriate gender displays. As in the above quotation from the warden and the confrontation described between Counselor Tynice and Sarah, sexuality took center stage in this discussion. Promiscuity, prostitution, and lesbianism signaled that something was "wrong." Notably, respondents rarely thematized inmates' past sexual victimization in their discussions of sexuality and offending, and only a few (a nurse, a PRW counselor, and several correctional officers) suggested that sexual victimization played a key role in what was "wrong." In addition to problematizing women's sexuality, administrators and staff at East State also questioned their performance as mothers. One correctional officer who had worked in East State for four years commented,

> I'm a mother of two and I know what that impulse, that instinct, that mothering instinct feels like. It just takes over, like, you would never put your kids in harm's way. . . . Women in here lack that. Something in their nature is not right, you know? They run out and leave their kids alone, babies, while they score drugs or go over to their boyfriend's house, you know? They neglect them, leave them with strangers or get high in front of them. And I know a lot of them feel really bad about it when they get in here and stop and think about it. But it's like they don't think of it out there, in the moment. That's a sign something is wrong, some kind of psychological problem or something.

Administrators and staff reconcile the self-interested criminal of the get tough platform with the disparate reality of women's offending by pointing to women's gender deviance, which, in turn, they use to legitimate psychological explanations and therapeutic interventions. The fact that hard core punishment comes by way of "rigorous" therapy is premised on the belief that women offenders have "something wrong on the inside." This is the significance of PRW's emphasis on habilitation rather than rehabilitation. Institutional beliefs regarding women's deviance extend beyond the sense that inmates have failed to internalize norms regarding substance use and unlawful behavior; it goes to their very embodiment of gender. The continual references to inmates' incomplete "socialization" and "lack of structure" refer to their failure to competently "do" gender (West and Zimmerman 1987). Women, according to institutional ideology, are (among other things), monogamous and heterosexual, diligent caretakers of children and the elderly, responsible, clean, and self-restrained. Indeed, the focal points of concern in PRW involve women's patterns of food consumption and weight, hygiene, romantic relations with other women, and relations with one's family, particularly children. These focal points of concern were mirrored within the prison more generally.

Prison staff were similarly concerned with "habilitating" their charges. The deputy warden noted during a 1996 interview,

> The problem before was that we tried to rehabilitate them, to show them where they went wrong. We didn't understand that they lack even the basics on which to build from. [PRW] showed us that. Now we hold them responsible for their behavior and we're tougher on them than we used to be, but we also want to make them better people when they get out of here.

Even the use of surveillance reflected the institution's interest in habilitating the gender deviant. For example, while the prison drug economy thrived in East State during the 1990s, correctional officers regularly used new surveillance technologies (cameras, listening devices, etc.) to confiscate "romantic" notes sent between inmates. The notes, more frequently than drugs or other serious rule violations, were a prominent topic of discussion in classification meetings. Classification personnel routinely used women's relations with family members and other inmates—information garnered primarily through surveillance tactics—as an assessment tool to determine whether an inmate was "willing to change" and what kinds of programs and work

opportunities would be suitable. Indeed, many of the diagnostic patterns that characterized interaction in PRW were replicated in the general prison facility. Surveillance techniques differed between the general prison facility and PRW (mounted cameras replaced graphic depictions of blue eyes), but the practice of surveillance operated in much the same way for similar ends.

Ironically, although "habilitation" was the stated goal, neither PRW nor the prison was equipped to restore inmates to the institution's idealized conception of femininity. The masculine subtext of the get tough philosophy made this an impossibility. East State opted to replicate the hard core characteristics of men's prisons in the hopes that such disciplinary practices would improve recidivism rates. They upgraded surveillance equipment, installed razor wire, and most important, brought in PRW. PRW's philosophy of the addict, like the get tough philosophy of criminality, presumed a masculine subject. The program's goal was the creation of an autonomous, self-interested self. From this perspective, women responded poorly indeed. The vice president of PII complained that women, unlike men in treatment, "wallow in their victimization." Their failure was not attributed to the program structure; it was attributed to the "feminine" self. Consider how Sarah's identity is constructed by Counselor Tynice in the pinball session—Sarah is characterized as weak, emotional, out of control, codependent, and hypersexual. Habilitation is accomplished not by teaching Sarah how to be an empowered, responsible woman—it is accomplished by alienating Sarah from qualities associated with a feminine self (e.g., displaying emotion and relational qualities are serious rule violations, and residents are reminded, "there are no friends in treatment").

PRW and the get tough platform of which it was a part were developed for men based exclusively on men's subject positions and their experiences with drugs and crime. In a model in which masculinity serves as the normative baseline, women's unique experiences and needs are rendered either invisible or deviant. There is no register for acknowledging that women occupy distinct positions in the social structure and that these distinct positions make the application of "universal" (read masculine) strategies to deal with criminality and drug use erroneous. Although prison staff informally acknowledged that women's criminality was different from men's, they attributed this to psychological rather than structural conditions. Subsequently, women's "difference" became the target of institutional control efforts.

The disciplinary hybrid that emerged, embodied surveillance, represented the institution's effort to fit a square peg (women's criminality) in a round hole (hard core control).

CONCLUSION: GENDER IN THE "EQUALITY WITH A VENGEANCE" ERA

On the surface, the "equality with a vengeance" era in women's corrections would appear to suggest that prisons have achieved a sort of gender neutrality, in which policies and programs that once would have been considered unthinkable in women's facilities are now implemented with widespread support. This study demonstrates that rather than signaling the decline of the gendered organization, the equality with a vengeance era marks a shift in how gender is conceived and elaborated within the criminal justice system. Sex role stereotypes are no longer the primary discursive vehicle through which new policies and programs are justified and implemented. Instead, get tough policies and hard core disciplinary practices are legitimated according to theories and characterizations of the "typical" criminal. This is similar to recent shifts in the gender politics of the welfare state. The 1996 passage of the Personal Responsibility Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act transferred what remained of state support for stay-at-home mothering to an exclusive focus on work in the paid labor market and work-related activities. The normative baseline for this model of welfare reform is the citizen worker—characterized by independence from the state, detachment from familial demands, and self-interest (Korteweg 2001; Fraser 1997). And just as the citizen worker is based on a masculine subject, so too is the typical criminal.

While current get tough policies occlude women's subjectivity, it is not the case that prison organizations treat women and men the same way. There is widespread acknowledgment within the system that women are different, but the source of the difference is attributed to psychological rather than structural elements. In this way, high rates of offending and recidivism are not seen as a failure of the system but as a failure of the women themselves. This necessitates a modification in the seemingly gender-neutral structure of control. Instead of preoccupying themselves with breaches in security and the potentiality of inmate revolt, administrators in East State were concerned with displays of

gender deviance. To simultaneously fix the feminine self and punish the criminal, administrators modified the hard core structure to include an embodied form of surveillance, one in which the observed and the observer are known to one another. This is in contrast to Foucault's (1977, 1980) discussion of the unverifiable character of surveillance mechanisms and therefore represents a crucial distinction between men's and women's prisons in the equality with a vengeance era. The gendered character of punishment results in a distinct system of social control within women's prisons that merges key features of punishment (in the form of surveillance) and therapy (in the form of diagnosis) to advance institutional claims about the deviant self and to engineer a shift in behavior. Notably, what is being inserted into the minds of inmates are not only institutional norms guiding conduct and behavior but institutional claims about gender and subjectivity.

NOTES

1. Pseudonyms are used in place of actual names to ensure confidentiality. In addition, the use of identifying information is avoided.

2. Women's prisons are economies of scale. Women typically constitute less than 10 percent of a state's inmate population, and subsequently, institutions and services for women receive a considerably smaller slice of the corrections budget than do services and facilities that cater to men (McCorkel 1996; Fletcher, Shaver, and Moon 1993; Ross and Fabiano 1986).

3. For a detailed discussion of therapeutic communities, see Bloor, McKeganey, and Fonkert (1988); DeLeon (1997); and Lockwood, McCorkel, and Inciardi (1998).

4. The Project Rehabilitate Women (PRW) program is housed in a separate wing of the prison facility in which inmate cells are arranged in a semicircular fashion around the perimeter of the unit. The interior of the cells is visible from virtually any central location in the unit since the doors are constructed of wood with a lengthy panel of glass running down the center of the door.

5. Given the myriad rules regulating conduct and expression in the program, all residents were selected to be the targets of confrontation at one point or another. The vast majority of residents were regularly confronted because staff believed the confrontations were a necessary and critical component of therapy.

6. According to the PRW orientation manual, pinball is a

> unique and dynamic encounter group where no one is safe from being addressed or allowed to respond to the confrontations. The energy created by this rapid-fire type of encounter commits residents to confront each other in a manner that is both uncensored, and at times verbally hostile. . . . The effect is two-fold. First, the resident is not able to respond and is forced to contain her

feelings until she is able to deal with them at a latter [*sic*] time. Secondly, the random confrontations provoke residents into exposing and breaking negative relationships.

7. In keeping with therapeutic community traditions established during the 1970s in treatment centers such as Synanon and Daytop Village, staff and residents of the program referred to one another as "family."

8. "Dialogue" is a command issued by counselors that gives residents permission to speak during periods such as encounter group when they are not otherwise permitted to do so.

9. In contrast to the prison facility within which it is a part, PRW is essentially secular. Residents are not required to participate in religious services, although the program does make an effort to accommodate the "spiritual needs" of residents by allowing them to observe religious holidays and participate in Sunday services held in the general prison. References to a "higher power" are made by staff during Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous groups when they are reading from Alcoholics Anonymous/Narcotics Anonymous literature, but in general, spirituality is considered a private matter in which staff rarely interfere.

10. The term *penitentiary* derives its meaning from Greek for "everything" and "a place of sight."

11. Although the depiction of an eye and the poster's phrase were supplied by the counselors, the color of the eye was selected by residents. That the eye was blue and not brown appears to be a comment on the racial character of institutional power. One of the residents who was in the program when the signs were first commissioned commented, "Yeah, it's pretty much brown eyes watching in here, but some of us are down; you know, it's the big blue eye in the sky! The white man, you know?"

12. "Sexual acting out" (as all nonheterosexual behaviors are deemed by the staff) was strictly forbidden in the program and served as grounds for immediate expulsion even if the behavior was consensual.

13. A number of research studies have reported that treatment and rehabilitative programs are often marginalized within men's prisons (see Pan et al. 1993; Irwin and Austin 1997; Inciardi and Lockwood 1994).

REFERENCES

Acker, Joan. 1990. Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society* 4 (2): 139-58.

———. 1992. From sex roles to gendered institutions. *Contemporary Sociology* 21:565-69.

Barnes, Henry Elmer. 1926. *The repression of crime*. New York: George H. Doran.

Bartky, Sandra Lee. 1988. Foucault, femininity, and the modernization of patriarchal power. In *Feminism and Foucault*, edited by Irene Diamond and Lee Quinby, 61-86. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Baskin, Deborah, Ira Sommers, Richard Tessler, and Henry Steadman. 1989. Role incongruence and gender variation in the provision of prison mental health services. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 30:305-14.

Beaumont, Gustave, and Alexis de Tocqueville. [1833] 1964. *On the penitentiary system in the United States and its application to France*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Bloom, Barbara, Meda Chesney-Lind, and Barbara Owen. 1994. *Women in California prisons*. San Francisco: Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice.

Bloor, Michael, Neil McKeganey, and Dick Fonkert. 1988. *One foot in Eden*. New York: Routledge.

Britton, Dana. 1999. Cat fights and gang fights. *Sociological Quarterly* 40 (3): 455-74.

———. 2000. The epistemology of the gendered organization. *Gender & Society* 14 (3): 418-34.

Chesney-Lind, Meda, and Joycelyn Pollock. 1995. Women's prisons: Equality with a vengeance. In *Women, law & social control*, edited by Alida Merlo and Joycelyn Pollock, 155-76. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Clawson, Mary Ann. 1999. When women play the bass: Instrument specialization and gender interpretation in alternative rock music. *Gender & Society* 13 (2): 193-210.

Cook, Clarissa, and Malcolm Waters. 1998. The impact of organizational form on gendered labor markets in engineering and law. *Sociological Review* 46 (2): 314-39.

DeLeon, George. 1997. *Community as method*. Wesport, CT: Praeger.

England, Paula, Melissa Herbert, Barbara Kilbourne, Lori Reid, and Lori Megdal. 1994. The gendered valuation of occupations and skills. *Social Forces* 73:65-99.

Feinman, Clarice. 1984. An historical overview of the treatment of incarcerated women. *The Prison Journal* 63 (2): 12-26.

Fletcher, Beverly, Lynda Dixon Shaver, and Dreama Moon. 1993. *Women prisoners: A forgotten population*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Discipline and punish*. New York: Random House.

———. 1980. *Power/knowledge*. New York: Pantheon.

Fraser, Nancy. 1997. *Justice interruptus*. New York: Routledge.

Freedman, Estelle. 1981. *Their sister's keepers*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Gardner, Carol Brooks. 1995. *Passing by: Gender and public harassment*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Giallombardo, Rose. 1966. *Society of women*. New York: John Wiley.

Gill, Virginia Teas, and Douglas Maynard. 1995. On "labeling" in actual interaction. *Social Problems* 42 (1): 11-37.

Goffman, Erving. 1961. *Asylums*. New York: Doubleday.

Habermas, Jurgen. 1975. *Legitimation crisis*. Boston: Beacon.

Hardesty, Monica. 1986. Plans and mood: A study in therapeutic relationships. In *Studies in symbolic interaction: Supplement 2 the Iowa school*, edited by Norman K. Denzin, 209-30. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Heffernan, Ester. 1972. *Making it in prison*. New York: John Wiley.

Hirsch, Adam Jay. 1992. *The rise of the penitentiary in America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Horwitz, Allan. 1984. Therapy and social solidarity. In *Toward a general theory of social control: Vol. 1*, edited by Donald Black, 211-50. New York: Academic Press.
Inciardi, James, and Dorothy Lockwood. 1994. When worlds collide. In *Drug abuse treatment*, edited by Frank Tims, Bennett Fletcher, James Inciardi, and Arthur Horton, 63-78. Wesport, CT: Greenwood.
Irwin, John, and James Austin. 1997. *It's about time*. Boston: Wadsworth.
Korteweg, Anna. 2001. What a difference a job makes: Welfare reform and the subject of the working mother. Presentation at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, 18-21 August, Anaheim, CA.
Leonard, Eileen. 1983. Judicial decisions and prison reform: The impact of litigation on women prisoners. *Social Forces* 31:45-58.
Lockwood, Dorothy, Jill McCorkel, and James Inciardi. 1998. Developing comprehensive prison-based therapeutic community treatment for women. *Drugs & Society* 13 (1/2): 193-212.
Lorber, Judith. 1994. *Paradoxes of gender.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
McCorkel, Jill. 1996. Justice, gender, and incarceration: An analysis of the leniency and severity debate. In *Examining the justice process*, edited by James Inciardi, 157-76. New York: Harcourt Brace.
———. 1998. Going to the crackhouse. *Symbolic Interaction* 21 (3): 227-52.
Morash, Merry, Robin Haarr, and Lila Rucker. 1994. A comparison of programming for women and men in US prisons since the 1980s. *Crime & Delinquency* 40:197-221.
Owen, Barbara. 1998. *In the mix*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Pan, Hao, Frank Scarpitti, James Inciardi, and Dorothy Lockwood. 1993. Some considerations on therapeutic communities in corrections. In *Drug treatment and criminal justice*, edited by James Inciardi, 30-43. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
Pollock, Joycelyn. 1990. *Women, prison, & crime*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
———. 1998. *Counseling women in prison*. London: Sage.
Rafter, Nicole Hahn. 1995. *Partial justice: Women, prisons, and social control*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
Reiman, Jeffrey. 1998. *The rich get richer and the poor get prison*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
Ridgeway, Cecelia. 1997. Interaction and the conservation of gender inequality. *American Sociological Review* 62:218-35.
Rosenbaum, Jill, and Meda Chesney-Lind. 1994. Appearance and delinquency: A research note. *Crime & Delinquency* 40 (2): 250-61.
Ross, Robert, and Elizabeth Fabiano. 1986. *Female offenders: Correctional afterthoughts*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
Rothman, David. 1971. *The discovery of the asylum*. Boston: Little, Brown.
Rusche, Georg, and Otto Kirchheimer. 1939. *Punishment and social structure*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Russell, Denise. 1995. *Women, madness, and medicine*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
Szasz, Thomas. 1963. *Law, liberty, and psychiatry.* New York: Collier Books.
Thorne, Barrie. 1994. *Gender play.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
Warren, Carol. 1991. *Madwives: Schizophrenic women in the 1950s*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
West, Candace, and Don Zimmerman. 1987. Doing gender. *Gender & Society* 1:125-51.